**Remarks/Arguments:** 

The applicant would like to thank the examiner for the telephonic interview on February

10, 2009, in which the claims and the prior art were discussed.

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed

October 30, 2008.

Claims 14-30 and 42-67 have been cancelled.

Claims 14-21, 23, 24, 26, 28-37 and 42-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Reed et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,288).

Claims 31-36 include the use of both one phase and two phase updates. The use of both

one phase and two phase updates in a system is not shown or made obvious by the cited prior art.

The examiner states that:

Regarding the one-phase and two-phase method mentioned

in claim 31, it is simply interpreted that the one-phase method corresponds to when there is no missing previous version, and the two-phase method corresponds to when

there is a missing previous version.

The independent claims have been amended to include the feature that "before the

replication is to be done, determining whether the replication should be accomplished in a one or

two phase method based on setup information". This distinguishes the examiners interpretation

of Reed. This feature makes it clear that the use of a one or two-phase method does not depend

on there being a missing previous version.

New claims 68-72 with the feature "multiple data items are replicated over the network,

each data item having an associated data item identifier; and wherein the version number is

9

associated with one of the data item identifiers have been" have been added.

Attorney Docket No.: ORACL-01077US2

JOmalley/ORACL/1077us2/103008 OA Response

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the

subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The

Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if they can assist in any way in

expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment

to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any

fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 18, 2009

By: /Joseph P. O'Malley/

Joseph P. O'Malley Reg. No. 36,226

Customer No. 80548 FLIESLER MEYER LLP

650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Francisco, California 941080

Telephone: (415) 362-3800

Attorney Docket No.: ORACL-01077US2 JOmalley/ORACL/1077us2/103008 OA Response 10